√·0

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/098,366	06/17/98	HIGASHIYAMA N	13237-2150

LM02/0120

M TODD MITCHEM
JONES & ASKEW
191 PEACHTREE STREET SUITE 3700
ATLANTA GA 30303-1769

EXAMINER
BASHORE,W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2777	

4

DATE MAILED:

01/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

[X] Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Sep 28, 1998_

[ ] This action is **FINAL**.

[ ] Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters,   **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_ 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____3___ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

[X] Claim(s) _1-20_____ is/are pending in the applicat

   Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

[ ] Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

[X] Claim(s) _1-20_____ is/are rejected.

[ ] Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

[ ] Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

[ ] See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

[ ] The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

[ ] The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is [ ] approved [ ] disapproved.

[ ] The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

[ ] The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

[ ] Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

   [ ] All [ ] Some* [X] None   of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

      [ ] received.

      [ ] received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

      [ ] received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   *Certified copies not received: _____

[ ] Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

[X] Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

[ ] Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

[ ] Interview Summary, PTO-413

[ ] Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

[ ] Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- _SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES_ ---

DETAILED ACTION

1.   **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter, U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued January 1999, in view of Gipson, U.S. Patent No. 7,778,402 issued July 1998.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim 1(a)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (see Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with claim 1(b)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of changing cursor presentation to indicate anticipated location an insertion point and formatting type in close proximity. However, Gipson teaches a method of an autocorrect feature which alters presented and inserted character strings (see Gipson column 20 lines 38-44; compare with claim 1(c)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the

method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of autocorrecting, providing

increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement

management (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim 1(d)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a

displayed program for editing purposes (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63; compare

with claim 1(e)).

In regard to dependent claim 2, claim 2 incorporates substantially similar subject

matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected as such.

(see claim 1(a) and 1(c); compare with claim 2).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby various types

of mouse clicks can be used in the embodiment of the invention as disclosed by Van De Vanter

(see Van De Vanter column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De

Vanter does not specifically teach a method of repeating the steps of claim 1(a) - 1(e) upon no

indication of cursor placement. However, Gipson teaches a method of repeating an evaluation

routine using a transition rule (see Gipson column 17 lines 28-31; compare with claim 4). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply

the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of

repetition, providing increased completeness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by

managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter

column 12 lines 22-29). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of formatting

comprising the addition/deletion of document properties. However, Gipson teaches a method of

an autocorrect feature which can add/delete inserted character strings (see Gipson column 20

lines 38-44; compare with claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter,

because of Gipson's taught advantage of autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness

to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 6, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De

Vanter teaches a method whereby localized lexical analysis is performed subsequent to an

insertion point defining a position of user editing (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-33;

compare with claim 6).

In regard to dependent claim 7, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating a rule with formatting steps, as well as a method for matching context information with a trigger and selecting a corresponding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method whereby rules are associated with, and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input (see Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30; compare with claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 8, with reference to the rejection of claim 1, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of associating a rule with formatting steps, said formatting steps performed with a coinciding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method whereby rules are associated and used to trigger evaluation routines for the ultimate purpose of autocorrecting input, the autocorrecting performing a sequence of steps resulting in replacement of text (see Gipson column 10 lines 9-13, 15-18, 25-30, column 22 lines 4-17; compare with claim 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of rules based autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness and accuracy to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 9, claim 9 reflects the computer program product

comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in

claim 8, and is rejected as such.

In regard to independent claim 10, claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject

matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected as such.

(see claim 1(a); compare with claim 10(a)).

(see claim 1(b); compare with claim 10(b)). In addition, Van De Vanter teaches the use of

a database for storing lexical rules (see Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with

claim 10(b)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of cursor selection and display based upon

insertion point position resulting in different editing behaviors (see Van De Vanter column 37

lines 59-67, column 37 lines 1-2; compare with claim 10(c) and 10(d)).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby an I-beam

cursor is presented based upon the position of an insertion point in the document (see Van De

Vanter column 37 lines 19-24; compare with claim 11).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment

markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (see Van

De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23; compare with claim 12).

In regard to dependent claim 13, claim 13 is rejected using the Examiner's argument

and rationale as set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the computer program product

comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in

claim 13, and is rejected as such.

In regard to independent claim 15, claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject

matter as claimed in claims 4, 8, and 10, and in further view of the following, is rejected as such.

(see claim 10(a); compare with claim 15(a)).

(see claim 10(b); compare with claim 15(b)).

(see claim 8; compare with claim 15(c)).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of matching an I-beam cursor relevant to

various insertion point positions (see Van De Vanter column 36 lines 64-67, column 37 lines 1-

3; compare with claim 15(d)).

(see claim 4; compare with claim 15(e)).

In regard to dependent claim 16, claim 16 is rejected using the Examiner's argument and rationale as set forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to dependent claim 17, Van De Vanter teaches a method of text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor, along with white space (see Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method whereby formatting properties are stored in association with a coinciding rule. However, Gipson teaches a method of an autocorrect feature which alters presented and inserted character strings by way of a composite rule creating a delayed edit action (see Gipson column 20 lines 38-44, column 19 lines 65-67, column 20 lines 1-6; compare with claim 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Gipson to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Gipson's taught advantage of autocorrecting, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 18, claim 18 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 17, and is rejected as such.

In regard to dependent claim 19, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a token stream, whereby dynamic user input results in updating insertion points and cursor positions of each

dynamic editing action which can be used with a mouse (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 19).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Van De Vanter teaches a method of an insertion point defining an actual editing location, said cursor location and analysis is updated subsequent to a user edit (see Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35; compare with claim 20).

Conclusion

2.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is (703) 308-5807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anton Fetting, can be reached on (703) 305-8449. The fax number to this art unit is (703) 308-6606.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

3.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

        Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
        Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

        (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

        (703) 305-9724 (for informal or draft communications, please label
        "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

W.L.B.
1/15/2000

                                                ANTON W. FETTING
                                        SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                                           TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700